INR-TH/03-3
January 2003

Determination of the numerical value for the strong coupling constant from tau decays in perturbative QCD*

A.A. Pivovarov

Institute for Nuclear Research of the Russian Academy of Sciences,
Moscow 117312

arXiv:hep-ph/0301074v1 12 Jan 2003

Abstract

The determination of the numerical value for the strong coupling constant from tau decays in perturbative QCD is briefly described. Main emphasis is made on the use of the renormalization scheme invariance of the theory for reducing uncertainties related to truncation of the series in the strong coupling constant. The analysis of the convergence of the series is presented and the possibility of the asymptotic growth at the NNNLO is discussed.

In this talk I briefly describe one aspect of τ physics – the use of data on τ-lepton hadronic decays for extracting a numerical value of the strong coupling constant that is mainly based on the recent analysis presented in ref. [1]. The accuracy of experimental data is steadily improving that provides a good opportunity for high precision tests of the theoretical description [2, 3, 4]. The underlying theory of strong interactions – QCD [5] – describes the observables related to the physics of τ-lepton hadronic decays within perturbation theory in the strong coupling constant, i.e. as a series expansion. The key question of theoretical description is a pattern of convergence of the related series. On general basis, it is believed that the series is asymptotic, however, in some concrete applications it can appear as a convergent series. Thus, establishing the accuracy with which the series, truncated in a given manner, represents the "full" result of perturbation theory calculation is a central question of using pQCD in low-energy phenomenology. The τ-lepton hadronic decays is a good place to investigate this problem since the theoretical description of the process is very clean. Indeed, the basic quantity is the two-point correlator of hadronic currents in the Euclidean domain which has been calculated with a very high degree of accuracy within perturbation theory [6, 7, 8] (for a review see [9]). Nonperturbative corrections to the correlator are known to be small and under control within the operator product expansion [10]. For comparison of experimental data with theoretical calculations one can choose inclusive observables that makes pQCD directly applicable to the description of the system [11, 12, 13, 14, 15, 16]. These features explain the interest attracted by the τ-lepton hadronic decays for extracting numerical values of the parameters of the standard model at lower energies. These values can then be compared with the results of high energy experiments that provides a powerful consistency check of QCD (and the standard model as a whole) for energies from $M_\tau = 1.777$ GeV till $M_Z = 91.187$ GeV (e.g. [17]).

I discuss in some detail the procedure of extracting numerical values of α_s from τ-data in perturbation theory. Since the numerical value of the expansion parameter α_s is not small at the M_τ scale the contribution of higher order terms in the perturbation theory series can be significant.

*Talk given at 15th International Seminar "Quarks-2002", Novgorod the Great, Russia, June 1-7, 2002

There are arguments that the accuracy of finite-order perturbation theory is already close to its asymptotic limit [18]. Therefore a kind of resummation is necessary. A powerful technique is $1/N_F$ expansion (e.g. [19]) that leads to renormalon-type resummation [20, 21, 22, 23, 24, 25] that can be formulated as an integral of the running coupling constant in momentum space. This technique is often used in the analysis based on Dyson-Schwinger equations [26, 27]. The result of the resummation under the integration sign depends strongly on the interpretation of higher order terms, e.g [28, 29, 30]. The resummation of contributions related to the running of the coupling constant in QCD was used as a basis for the tau lepton decays analysis in contour improved perturbation theory [14, 31].

The central point to be discussed in the talk is an explicit use of renormalization group invariance of the theory in order to analyze the τ-lepton decay rate in the most optimal way within perturbation theory. Renormalization group invariance is a fundamental property of perturbation theory in quantum field theory which is (formally) related to the freedom in defining the subtraction procedure [32]. Its explicit compliance may make a numerical analysis more reliable and stable. Note that it can be viewed in a broader context as an optimal choice of the starting point for the perturbative expansion, i.e. the way of splitting the whole Hamiltonian into two parts: the leading one that is considered to be large and "perturbation" that is considered to be small and can be taken within perturbation theory. The influence of the proper choice of the initial approximation on the accuracy of the analysis can be clearly seen in model examples [33] or in the framework of effective theories [34, 35]. In QCD the renormalization group invariance allows one to formally perform the numerical analysis in any renormalization scheme because all schemes are connected by a renormalization group transformation [36, 37]. In the finite-order perturbation theory approach this equivalence is only approximate and broken by higher order terms which introduce numerical differences into the results obtained in different renormalization schemes for the same quantities. Generally there many ways of using perturbation theory calculations. One is to find direct relations between physical observables which are renormalization group invariant. Then perturbation theory calculations are just a purely intermediate step for finding formal relations between observables (see, e.g. [18, 38]) and no numerical analysis for renormalization scheme noninvariant quantities is performed. Indeed, let the perturbation theory expressions for two observables $\mathcal{O}_{1,2}$ in a given scheme have the form

$$\mathcal{O}_1 = \alpha_s + r_1\alpha_s^2 + O(\alpha_s^3), \quad \mathcal{O}_2 = \alpha_s + r_2\alpha_s^2 + O(\alpha_s^3)\,. \tag{1}$$

Then the perturbation theory relation between observables $\mathcal{O}_{1,2}$ reads

$$\mathcal{O}_2 = \mathcal{O}_1 + (r_2 - r_1)\mathcal{O}_1^2 + O(\mathcal{O}_1^3) \tag{2}$$

and is scheme-independent. The difference $r_2 - r_1$ takes the same value for calculations in any scheme. Another way of using the result of perturbation theory calculations is to extract numerical values for renormalization scheme noninvariant quantities (as the coupling constant in a fixed scheme) and then use it for predictions of different observables. The truncation of the perturbation theory series leads to numerical violations of renormalization scheme invariance and plays an essential role. In our simple example this means that the relations in eq. (1) are treated as quadratic functions of α_s in some fixed scheme and the accuracy of extraction of the coupling constant value (and prediction of other observables) depends drastically on the scheme used, i.e. on the numerical values of the coefficients $r_{1,2}$. This happens because the accuracy is estimated in a heuristic way by considering the apparent convergence or the magnitude of the last term. There is an analogy with gauge invariance (or any other symmetry): one can either work with invariant quantities or fix the gauge and compute in terms of noninvariant quantities but the final result for physical observables

(in a gauge invariant sector) will be the same. In practical application it is realized, for instance, as calculation in covariant or external field gauges.

The concrete example of this talk is the extraction of a numerical value for the coupling constant which is not an immediate physical quantity. By convention the reference value of the coupling constant that is used to compare between different experiments is fixed to be the $\overline{\rm MS}$-scheme one. However, this does not necessarily mean that for its extraction from a given experiment the numerical analysis should be performed in the $\overline{\rm MS}$-scheme. It can be numerically accurate to analyze the system in its internal scheme and after finding numerical values for the internal parameters translate them into the $\overline{\rm MS}$-scheme using renormalization scheme transformation. This program is based on explicit renormalization scheme covariance of the theory (as calculations in different gauges are only possible (i.e. meaningful) for the gauge invariant sector of gauge theories). Note that the analogy with gauge is not quite complete: gauge invariance is exact order by order in perturbation theory while the renormalization scheme invariance is only exact for a 'full' quantity while for truncated series it is only accurate precise with accuracy the order of the value of the first omitted term. Note also that gauge invariant quantities could not always be put into the same order of perturbation series. The approach used below, in practice, means that any scheme is allowed for the analysis of a particular quantity while the transition between the schemes is considered to be exact. Therefore numerical values obtained in the $\overline{\rm MS}$-scheme directly and through renormalization group transformations can differ. In fact, in the spirit of the perturbation theory the internal scheme results are most reliable physically and are more stable numerically than the results of the standard analysis in the $\overline{\rm MS}$-scheme. The numerical values for the reference $\overline{\rm MS}$-scheme parameters are obtained by a renormalization group transformation from the numerical values found in the internal schemes. Renormalization group transformation is a quite formal operation and can be controlled numerically. For instance, the change of scale is a renormalization group transformation.

We consider a simplest example that exhibits relevant features –the normalized τ-lepton decay rate into nonstrange hadrons $H_{S=0}$ that is given by

$$R_{\tau S=0} = \frac{\Gamma(\tau \to H_{S=0}\nu)}{\Gamma(\tau \to l\bar{\nu}\nu)} = N_c|V_{ud}|^2 S_{EW}(1+\delta_P+\delta_{EW}+\delta_{NP}) \tag{3}$$

where $N_c = 3$ is the number of colors. The first term in eq. (3) is the parton model result, the second term δ_P represents perturbative QCD effects. V_{ud} is the flavor mixing matrix element [4]. The factor S_{EW} is an electroweak correction term [39] and $\delta_{EW} = 0.001$ is an additive electroweak correction [40]. The nonperturbative corrections are rather small and consistent with zero; $\delta_{NP} = -0.003 \pm 0.003$ (see e.g. [13]). For numerical estimates the factorization approximation for four-quark condensates is essential: it has been studied within x space sum rules and found to be under control [41]. Note that recently the problem of duality violation for two-point correlators has been discussed [42, 43]. However, no established quantitative estimates of that violation are available yet. This problem can affect the numerical value of the coupling extracted from the analysis because of the numerical change of the quantity δ_P extracted from eq. (3). However, no established quantitative estimates of that violation are available yet. We concentrate on the perturbative part of the decay rate and numerical uncertainties related to the renormalization scheme freedom of perturbation theory. In this respect new possible corrections do not qualitatively affect our analysis. The corrections due to duality violation are of a new nature and they can be added independently to eq. (3). They would only change the input numerical value for the δ_P within our approach.

The value for the decay rate $R_{\tau S=0}$ has been measured by the ALEPH [2] and OPAL [3] collaborations with results very close to each other. Using (for definiteness only) the ALEPH data $R^{exp}_{\tau S=0} = 3.492 \pm 0.016$ one obtains from eq. (3) a numerical value for the main experimental

parameter of the discussed observable

$$\delta_P^{\rm exp} = 0.203 \pm 0.007 \ . \tag{4}$$

Eq. (4) is the main experimental input that is used in the analysis below.

Theoretically one starts with the determination of the differential decay rate of the τ lepton into a hadronic system $H(s)$ with a total squared energy s

$$\frac{d\sigma(\tau \to \nu H(s))}{ds} \sim \left(1 - \frac{s}{M_\tau^2}\right)^2 \left(1 + \frac{2s}{M_\tau^2}\right) \rho(s)$$

that is given by the hadronic spectral density $\rho(s)$ defined through the correlator of weak currents. For the (ud) current $j_\mu^W(x) = \bar{u}\gamma_\mu(1-\gamma_5)d$ one finds in massless approximation for the light quarks

$$i\int \langle T j_\mu^W(x) j_\nu^{W+}(0)\rangle e^{iqx} dx = (q_\mu q_\nu - q^2 g_{\mu\nu})\Pi^{\rm had}(q^2), \quad \Pi^{\rm had}(q^2) = \int \frac{\rho(s)ds}{s-q^2} \tag{5}$$

with $\rho(s) \sim {\rm Im}\ \Pi^{\rm had}(s+i0)$, $s = q^2$.

Integrating the function $\Pi^{\rm had}(z)$ over a contour in the complex q^2 plane beyond the physical cut $s > 0$ one finds that for particular weight functions some integrals of the hadronic spectral density $\rho(s)$ can be reliably computed theoretically [44, 45]. Indeed, due to Cauchy theorem one gets

$$\oint_C \Pi(z)dz = \int_{\rm cut} \rho(s)ds \ .$$

Using the approximation $\Pi^{\rm had}(z)|_{z\in C} \approx \Pi^{\rm th}(z)|_{z\in C}$ which is well justified sufficiently far from the physical cut one obtains

$$\oint_C \Pi^{\rm had}(z)dz = \int_{\rm cut} \rho(s)ds = \oint_C \Pi^{\rm th}(z)dz$$

i.e. the integral over the hadronic spectrum can theoretically be evaluated. In practice, $\Pi^{\rm th}(z)$ is computed within OPE, i.e. the function $\Pi^{\rm th}(Q^2)$ with $Q^2 = -q^2$ is calculable in pQCD far from the physical cut as a series in the running coupling constant $\alpha_s(Q^2)$ with power corrections. Further improvements on theory side can be made – for instance, instanton-induced contributions can be added. The lattice approximation for the evaluation of the correlator $\Pi^{\rm th}(Q^2)$ beyond perturbation theory can also be used [46].

The total decay rate of the τ lepton written in the form of an integral along the cut

$$R_{\tau S=0} = \frac{\Gamma(\tau \to H_{S=0}\nu)}{\Gamma(\tau \to l\bar{\nu}\nu)} \sim \int_{\rm cut} \left(1 - \frac{s}{M_\tau^2}\right)^2 \left(1 + \frac{2s}{M_\tau^2}\right) \rho(s)ds$$

is precisely the quantity that one can reliably compute in pQCD.

The basic object of the theoretical calculation is Adler's D-function which is given by the representation

$$D(Q^2) = -Q^2 \frac{d}{dQ^2}\Pi^{\rm had}(Q^2) \ . \tag{6}$$

In the $\overline{\rm MS}$-scheme the perturbative expansion for the D-function is given by

$$D(Q^2) = 1 + \frac{\alpha_s(Q)}{\pi} + k_1\left(\frac{\alpha_s(Q)}{\pi}\right)^2 + k_2\left(\frac{\alpha_s(Q)}{\pi}\right)^3 + k_3\left(\frac{\alpha_s(Q)}{\pi}\right)^4 + O(\alpha_s(Q)^5) \tag{7}$$

with (see e.g. [9])

$$k_1 = \frac{299}{24} - 9\zeta(3), \quad k_2 = \frac{58057}{288} - \frac{779}{4}\zeta(3) + \frac{75}{2}\zeta(5)\,. \tag{8}$$

The notation $a_s(Q) = \alpha_s(Q)/\pi$ for the standard $\overline{\rm MS}$-coupling constant normalized at the scale $\mu = Q$ is used. Numerically one finds

$$D(Q^2) = 1 + a_s(Q) + 1.6398 a_s(Q)^2 + 6.3710 a_s(Q)^3 + k_3 a_s(Q)^4 + O(a_s^5(Q))\,. \tag{9}$$

The coefficient k_3 is known only partly [47]. The particular numerical value of $k_3 \sim 25$ is obtained on the basis of geometric series approximation for the series (9) and is often used in the literature [16, 48, 49]. Below I keep this coefficient for illustrative purposes to see the potential influence of this term on the numerical value of the coupling constant extracted from τ-data.

In the $\overline{\rm MS}$-scheme the perturbative correction δ_P is given by the perturbation theory expansion

$$\delta_P^{th} = a_s + 5.2023 a_s^2 + 26.366 a_s^3 + (78.003 + k_3) a_s^4 + O(a_s^5) \tag{10}$$

where the $\overline{\rm MS}$-scheme coupling constant $\alpha_s = \pi a_s$ is taken at the scale of the τ-lepton mass $\mu = M_\tau = 1.777$ GeV. Usually one extracts a numerical value for $\alpha_s(M_\tau)$ by treating the first three terms of the expression in eq. (10) as an exact function – the cubic polynomial, i.e. one solves the equation

$$a_s + 5.2023 a_s^2 + 26.366 a_s^3 = \delta_P^{\rm exp}\,. \tag{11}$$

The solution reads

$$\pi a_s^{st}(M_\tau) \equiv \alpha_s^{st}(M_\tau) = 0.3404 \pm 0.0073_{exp}\,. \tag{12}$$

This is a standard method. The quoted error is due to the error in the input value of δ_P^{exp}. It is rather difficult to estimate the theoretical uncertainty of the procedure itself. The main problem is to estimate the quality of the approximation for the (asymptotic) series in eq. (10) given by the cubic polynomial in eq. (11).

As a criterion of the quality of the approximation one can use the pattern of convergence of the series (10) which is

$$\delta_P^{\rm exp} = 0.203 = 0.108 + 0.061 + 0.034 + \ldots \tag{13}$$

One sees that the corrections provide a 100% change of the leading term. Another criterion is the order-by-order behavior of the extracted numerical value for the coupling constant. In consecutive orders of perturbation theory (LO – leading order, NLO – next-to-leading order, NNLO – next-next-to-leading order) one has

$$\alpha_s^{st}(M_\tau)_{LO} = 0.6377, \quad \alpha_s^{st}(M_\tau)_{NLO} = 0.3882, \quad \alpha_s^{st}(M_\tau)_{NNLO} = 0.3404\,. \tag{14}$$

One obtains a series for the numerical value of the coupling constant

$$\alpha_s^{st}(M_\tau)_{NNLO} \;\; = \;\; 0.6377 - 0.2495 - 0.0478 - \ldots \tag{15}$$

Up to the next-to-next-to-leading order result (NNLO) we can take a half of the last term as an estimate of the theoretical uncertainty. No rigorous justification can be given for such an assumption about the accuracy of the approximation without knowledge of the structure of the whole series: it is taken for definiteness. The theoretical uncertainty obtained in such a way – $\Delta\alpha_s^{st}(M_\tau)_{th} = 0.0239$ – is much larger than the experimental uncertainty given in eq. (12). This is a challenge for the

theory: the accuracy of theoretical formulas cannot compete with experimental precision at present. Assuming this theoretical uncertainty we have

$$\alpha_s^{st}(M_\tau)_{NNLO} = 0.3404 \pm 0.0239_{th} \pm 0.0073_{exp}. \tag{16}$$

Theory dominates the error even if the estimate for its precision $\pm 0.0239_{th}$ is not reliable (heuristic and only indicative). Thus the straightforward analysis in the $\overline{\rm MS}$-scheme is not stable numerically and the naive estimate of the theoretical uncertainty is large.

To highlight the essence of the problem let me choose a different coupling constant as an expansion parameter that is obtained by the simple RG transformation – the change of scale of the coupling along the RG trajectory $M_\tau \to 1$ GeV. It is often called scale transformation which is still a subgroup of the full renormalization group. In terms of $a_s(1\text{ GeV})$ one finds a series $a_s(1)+2.615a_s(1)^2+1.54a_s(1)^3 = \delta_P^{\rm exp}$. The solution for the coupling constant is $\alpha_s(1\text{ GeV}) = 0.453$. The convergence pattern for the correction $\delta_P^{\rm exp}$ is $\delta_P^{\rm exp} = 0.203 = 0.144 + 0.054 + 0.005$ and for the numerical value of the coupling constant $\alpha_s(1\text{ GeV}) = 0.453 = 0.638 - 0.177 - 0.008$. Should one conclude that now the accuracy is much better? What would be an invariant criterion for the precision of theoretical predictions obtained from perturbation theory, i.e. finite number of terms of asymptotic series? Thus, one sees that the renormalization scheme dependence can strongly obscure the heuristic evaluation of the accuracy of theoretical formulae in the absence of any information on the structure of the whole perturbation theory series.

The use of the $\overline{\rm MS}$-scheme is not obligatory for physical applications. The $\overline{\rm MS}$-scheme has a history of success for massless calculations where its results look natural and the corrections are usually small. This is not the strict rule, however, and there are cases (like gluonic correlators [50]) where corrections dramatically depend on the quantum numbers of the operators. In fact, the $\overline{\rm MS}$-scheme is rather artificial. It is simply defined by convention (let us be remindful of the evolution from the MS-scheme to the $\overline{\rm MS}$-scheme which had its origin only in technical convenience [51]). From technical point of view, in practical calculations of massless diagrams of the propagator type, another scheme – the G-scheme – is the most natural one [52]. It normalizes the basic quantity of the whole calculation within integration-by-parts technique – one loop massless scalar diagram – to unity [53]. β-functions coincide in both schemes. It could have well happened that the G-scheme would be historically adopted as the reference scheme because corrections in this scheme are typically smaller than that in the $\overline{\rm MS}$-scheme. However, for the tau system the direct (standard) analysis in the G-scheme fails.

Note that strictly speaking any scheme is suitable for a given perturbative calculation. However, it can lead to unusual (or even unacceptable) results in a numerical analysis. The only criterion for the choice of scheme at present is the heuristic requirement of fast explicit convergence: the terms of the series should decrease. Clearly this is a rather unreliable criterion. It does not provide strict quantitative constraints necessary for the level of precision usually claimed for the τ-system analysis.

One can however work within a different paradigm that is independent of the scheme in what the actual calculation has been performed. One just extracts a scale that any observable generates due to dimensional transmutation in perturbation theory and which is its internal scale. It is natural for a numerical analysis to determine this scale first. For comparison with other channels one can then transform the result into a $\overline{\rm MS}$-scheme or any other reference scheme using the renormalization group invariance. This last step is done only for comparison with other experiments (or just for convenience; the system itself can be well described in its internal scheme without any reference to the $\overline{\rm MS}$-scheme).

The running of the coupling is one of the central features of QCD and very important for numerical analysis. A parameterization of the trajectory can be done at infinite Q by using dimensional

scale of QCD. The renormalization group equation

$$\mu^2 \frac{d}{d\mu^2} a(\mu^2) = \beta(a(\mu^2)), \quad a = \frac{\alpha}{\pi} \tag{17}$$

is solved by the integral

$$\ln\left(\frac{\mu^2}{\Lambda^2}\right) = \Phi(a(\mu^2)) + \int_0^{a(\mu^2)} \left(\frac{1}{\beta(\xi)} - \frac{1}{\beta_2(\xi)}\right) d\xi \tag{18}$$

where the indefinite integral $\Phi(a)$ is normalized as follows

$$\Phi(a) = \int^a \frac{1}{\beta_2(\xi)} d\xi = \frac{1}{a\beta_0} + \frac{\beta_1}{\beta_0^2} \ln\left(\frac{a\beta_0^2}{\beta_0 + a\beta_1}\right). \tag{19}$$

Here $\beta_2(a)$ and $\beta(a)$ denote the second order and full β function, or as many terms as are available, given by

$$\beta_2(a) = -a^2(\beta_0 + a\beta_1), \quad \beta(a) = -a^2(\beta_0 + \beta_1 a + \beta_2 a^2 + \beta_3 a^3) + O(a^6), \tag{20}$$

a is a generic coupling constant. The four-loop β-function coefficient β_3 is now known in the $\overline{\rm MS}$-scheme [54]

$$\beta_3 = \frac{140599}{4608} + \frac{445}{32}\zeta(3) = 47.228\ldots \tag{21}$$

The adjustment of the integration constant in eq. (18) defines the standard QCD scale Λ_s: the asymptotic expansion of the coupling constant at large momenta $Q^2 \to \infty$ reads

$$a(Q^2) = \frac{1}{\beta_0 L}\left(1 - \frac{\beta_1}{\beta_0^2}\frac{\ln(L)}{L}\right) + O\left(\frac{1}{L^3}\right), \qquad L = \ln\left(\frac{Q^2}{\Lambda^2}\right). \tag{22}$$

The solution (18) of the renormalization group equation (17) describes the evolution trajectory of the coupling constant. The evolution trajectory of the coupling constant given by the solution (18) of the renormalization group equation (17) is parametrized by the scale parameter Λ and the coefficients of the β function β_i with $i > 2$ (see e.g. [36]). The evolution is invariant under the renormalization group transformation

$$a \to a(1 + \kappa_1 a + \kappa_2 a^2 + \kappa_3 a^3 + \ldots) \tag{23}$$

with the simultaneous change

$$\Lambda^2 \to \Lambda^2 e^{-\kappa_1/\beta_0}, \tag{24}$$

$\beta_{0,1}$ left invariant and

$$\begin{aligned} \beta_2 &\to \beta_2 - \kappa_1^2\beta_0 + \kappa_2\beta_0 - \kappa_1\beta_1 \\ \beta_3 &\to \beta_3 + 4\kappa_1^3\beta_0 + 2\kappa_3\beta_0 + \kappa_1^2\beta_1 - 2\kappa_1(3\kappa_2\beta_0 + \beta_2). \end{aligned}$$

If this transformation was considered to be exact and the exact β-function corresponding to the new charge was used then it would be just a change of variable in a differential equation (17) or the exact reparametrization of the trajectory (18) and hence would lead to identical results. However, the renormalization group invariance of eq. (18) is violated in higher orders of the coupling constant because we consistently omit higher orders in the perturbation theory expressions for the β-functions. This is the point where the finite-order perturbation theory approximation for the

respective β-functions is made. This is the source for different numerical outputs of analyses in different schemes.

Then the paradigm is to use the optimal charge and extract the coupling using exact RG technique. One introduces an effective charge a_τ through the relation $\delta_P^{th} = a_\tau \equiv \alpha_\tau/\pi$ [38, 55, 56, 57, 58] and extracts the parameter Λ_τ which is associated with a_τ through eq. (18). This is just the internal scale associated with the physical observable R_τ. The effective β-function is given by the expression

$$\beta_\tau = -a_\tau^2(\beta_{\tau 0} + \beta_{\tau 1} a_\tau + \beta_{\tau 2} a_\tau^2 + \beta_{\tau 3} a_\tau^3 + \ldots) \tag{25}$$

with $\beta_{\tau 0} = \beta_0$, $\beta_{\tau 1} = \beta_1$, and

$$\beta_{\tau 2} = -12.3204\,, \quad \beta_{\tau 3} = -182.719 + \frac{9}{2} k_3\,. \tag{26}$$

The extraction of the numerical value for the internal scale Λ_τ is done from equation (18) with $a_\tau(M_\tau) = \delta_P^{\rm exp}$. The coefficient $\beta_{\tau 3}$ does not enter the analysis. The parameter $\Lambda_s \equiv \Lambda_{\overline{\rm MS}}$ is found according to eq. (24). The $\overline{\rm MS}$ coupling at $\mu = M_\tau$ is obtained by solving eq. (18) for $a_s(M_\tau)$ with regard to $\ln(M_\tau^2/\Lambda_s^2)$ which is known if Λ_s is obtained; the β-function is taken in the $\overline{\rm MS}$-scheme. For consistency reasons we only use the $\overline{\rm MS}$-scheme β-function to three-loop order since the effective β-function β_τ is only known up to the second order, cf. eq. (26). A N^3LO analysis is possible only if a definite value is chosen for k_3. Some estimates are given below.

The procedure is based on renormalization group invariance and one can start from the expression for the decay rate obtained in any scheme. The only perturbative objects present are the β-functions: it is the converge of perturbation theory for β-functions that determines the accuracy. It also highlights the limit of precision within this procedure: the expansion for β_τ is believed to be asymptotic as any expansion in perturbation theory. The asymptotic expansion provides only limited accuracy for any given numerical value of the expansion parameter which cannot be further improved by including higher order terms. The expansion used is presumably rather close to its asymptotic limit

$$\beta_\tau(a_\tau) = -a_\tau^2 \left(\frac{9}{4} + 4a_\tau - 12.3204 a_\tau^2 + a_\tau^3 \left(-182.719 + \frac{9}{2} k_3\right)\right) + O(a_\tau^6) \tag{27}$$

with $a_\tau \sim 0.2$ at the scale M_τ. The convergence of the series depends crucially on the numerical value of k_3. If k_3 had a value where the asymptotic growth starts at third order then further improvement of the accuracy within finite-order perturbation theory is impossible.

At every order of the analysis we use the whole information of the perturbation theory calculation. Especially, the appropriate coefficient of the β_τ-function is present. In the standard method the coefficient β_2 enters only at order $O(\alpha_s^4)$ of the τ-lepton decay rate expansion. The described procedure can be called the renormalization scheme invariant extraction method (RSI) that means that it is based on renormalization scheme invariance. It does not mean that renormalization scheme uncertainty is completely eliminated but that it put under control in terms of explicit convergence of the effective β function. It is also clear since α_s itself is not a physical object and is not renormalization scheme invariant. In this respect we extract the noninvariant parameter α_s using invariance of the physics in order to perform the numerical analysis in the most suitable scheme. The output of the analysis is transformed into a numerical value for α_s according to the renormalization group transformation rules that are treated exactly for the given order of the effective β function. For the coupling constant in the $\overline{\rm MS}$-scheme in NNLO it gives

$$\alpha_s^{RSI}(M_\tau) \quad = \quad 0.3184 \pm 0.0060_{exp} \tag{28}$$

which is smaller than the corresponding value obtained within the standard procedure eq. (12). The key question is how to estimate the quality of this result? The parameter which is really extracted in consecutive orders of perturbation theory within the method is the scale Λ_τ. Because of the relation

$$\Lambda_s = \Lambda_\tau e^{-5.20232/2\beta_0} = 0.3147\Lambda_\tau \tag{29}$$

one can look at Λ_s directly. One finds

$$\Lambda_s|_{LO} = 595 \text{ MeV}, \quad \Lambda_s|_{NLO} = 288 \text{ MeV}, \quad \Lambda_s|_{NNLO} = 349 \text{ MeV} \tag{30}$$

or, representing the NNLO result as a formal series,

$$\Lambda_s|_{NNLO} = 595 - 307 + 61 - \dots \text{ MeV}. \tag{31}$$

Note that at leading order the scales (as well as charges) are equal in all schemes. Therefore the leading order result ($\Lambda_s|_{LO} = 595$ MeV) is not representative, only indicative. Assuming the uncertainty of Λ_s to be given by the half of the last term of the series (31) one has $\Lambda_s = 349 \pm 31$ MeV which leads to the numerical value for the $\overline{\text{MS}}$-scheme coupling constant

$$\alpha_s = 0.3184^{-0.0157}_{+0.0160}\,. \tag{32}$$

This result is obtained from eq. (18) with three-loop β-function. Taking the average we find

$$\alpha_s = 0.3184 \pm 0.0159\,. \tag{33}$$

This is better than the theoretical error of the standard result eq. (16). Still the theoretical error should be considered as a guess rather than a well-justified estimate of the uncertainty. It is affected by higher order terms, e.g. by the k_3 contribution. Clearly the estimate $k_3 = 25$ is rather speculative. Therefore it is more instructive to determine the range of k_3 which is safe for explicit convergence of perturbation theory. If the actual value of k_3 will be discovered in this range then perturbation theory is still valid and will give better accuracy in NNNLO. If not, the asymptotic growth of perturbation theory series is already reached and its accuracy cannot be improved.

We require that the last term should be equal to the half of the previous one. In the standard way (eq. 10) we have

$$|(78 + k_3)a_s| < \frac{1}{2}\,26.36 \approx 13 \tag{34}$$

which for $a_s = 0.1$ gives

$$-208 < k_3^{st} < 52\,. \tag{35}$$

In the RSI way (eq. 27) we have

$$|(-182 + \frac{9}{2}k_3)a_\tau| < \frac{1}{2}\,12.32 \approx 6 \tag{36}$$

which for $a_\tau = 0.2$ gives

$$33.8 < k_3^\tau < 47.1\,. \tag{37}$$

This range is much narrower than that in eq. (35). The effective scheme method is much more sensitive to the structure of the series as can be seen from eq. (27). The actual precision depends on the actual value chosen for k_3 and it is rather premature to speculate about numbers.

Still we show the worst result (in the optimistic scenario that k_3 lies in the safe range) that can be expected within the RSI approach. In the RSI approach with $k_3 = 47$ we find the scale parameter in NNNLO

$$\Lambda_s|_{NNNLO} = 334 \text{ MeV}\,. \tag{38}$$

With $k_3 = 34$ one has

$$\Lambda_s|_{NNNLO} = 367 \text{ MeV}\,. \tag{39}$$

Taking the average we have

$$\Lambda_s = 350 \pm 17 \text{ MeV} \tag{40}$$

which is the best possible estimate if we require that the perturbation theory series for the β_τ-function still converges (according to our quantitative criterion of convergence). That results in the numerical value for the $\overline{\text{MS}}$-scheme coupling constant found with four-loop β-function from eq. (18)

$$0.3133 < \alpha_s < 0.3314\,. \tag{41}$$

Therefore our conservative estimate of the theoretical error in the optimistic scenario for the convergence of perturbation theory series in NNNLO reads

$$\alpha_s = 0.322 \pm 0.009\,. \tag{42}$$

One should keep in mind that the theoretical uncertainty still depends on the criteria chosen. This particular estimate comes from the requirement of the explicit convergence of the effective beta function.

The value of the coupling constant can be run to the scale $M_Z = 91.187$ GeV with the RG For the standard method one finds

$$\alpha_s^{st}(M_Z) = 0.1210 \pm 0.0008_{exp} \pm 0.0006_c \pm 0.0001_b \tag{43}$$

where the subscript exp denotes the error originating from δ_P^{exp}. The errors with subscripts c, b arise from the uncertainty of the numerical values of the charm and bottom quark masses that enter the evolution analysis. The running to this reference scale is done with the four-loop β-function in the $\overline{\text{MS}}$-scheme [54] and three-loop matching conditions at the heavy quark (charm and bottom) thresholds [59]. The threshold parameters related to heavy quark masses are $\mu_c = \bar{m}_c(\mu_c) = (1.35 \pm 0.15)$ GeV and $\mu_b = \bar{m}_b(\mu_b) = (4.21 \pm 0.11)$ GeV (e.g. [60]) where $\bar{m}_q(\mu)$ is the running mass of the heavy quark in the $\overline{\text{MS}}$-scheme.

The running of $\alpha_s^{RSI}(M_\tau)$ from eq. (33) gives

$$\alpha_s^{RSI}(M_Z) = 0.1184 \pm 0.00074_{exp} \pm 0.00053_c \pm 0.00005_b \tag{44}$$

The theoretical uncertainty comes mainly from the truncation of the perturbation theory series. Taking the result of the NNLO analysis eq. (33) one finds

$$\Delta\alpha_s^{RSI}(M_Z)_{th} = 0.0019 \tag{45}$$

In the most optimistic scenario with the NNNLO analysis eq. (42) one has

$$\alpha_s^{RSI}(M_Z)_{N^3LO} = 0.119 \pm 0.001\,. \tag{46}$$

Note that for the Cabibbo suppressed decays that can also be analyzed within the perturbation theory [61, 62, 63] the approach looks quite natural as there are additional functions to be studied: two functions related to m_s^2 perturbative corrections. Then three coefficient functions should be analyzed together that allows one to factor out the renormalization scheme dependence to large extent [64].

Now I briefly comment on the extraction of the strong coupling constant within resummed perturbation theory. There are basically two possibilities to resum perturbation theory series that

have recently been analyzed in some details [65]. One is to extrapolate the running of the coupling into the infrared region using a natural cutoff provided by analytic continuation (so called π^2 terms [66, 67]). This approach relies on the pattern of continuation of the coupling constant to the infrared region. Another approach is based on the integration along the contour in Euclidean domain, it bypass the potentially nonperturbative region along safe areas in the complex momentum plane and, therefore, is quite perturbative in nature [14]. Numerically the results of these two approaches are different. In fact, they are also nonequivalent mathematically and the difference can be explicitly calculated: it happens to be nonexpandable in al_s that means that it is not noticeable within perturbation theory. As for the numerical results one fits the theoretical expression for the decay rate in the contour improved approach to the experimental result $\delta_P^{\rm exp}$ eq. (4) and find

$$\alpha_s^{CI}(M_\tau) = 0.343 \pm 0.009_{exp} \tag{47}$$

within the renormalization scheme invariant extraction method described above i.e. with the introduction of the effective charge first [31]. This value differs from the finite-order perturbation theory result eq. (28) which is expected.

To conclude, the procedure of extracting the numerical value of the strong coupling constant from τ-data is briefly described with main emphasis on the particular features that are related to the renormalization scheme invariance of the theory.

The present work is supported in part by the Russian Fund for Basic Research under contract 02-01-00601 and by INTAS grant.

References

[1] J.G. Körner, F. Krajewski and A.A. Pivovarov, Phys. Rev. D **63**, 036001 (2001).

[2] ALEPH collaboration, Z. Phys. C **76**, 15 (1997), Eur. Phys. J. C **4**, 409 (1998).

[3] OPAL collaboration, Eur. Phys. J. C **7**, 571 (1999).

[4] D. E. Groom et al. (Particle Data Group), Eur. Phys. J. C **15**, 1 (2000).

[5] C. N. Yang and R. L. Mills, Phys. Rev. **96**, 191 (1954); M. Gell-Mann, Phys. Lett. **8**, 214 (1964); M-Y. Han, Y. Nambu, Phys. Rev. B **139**, 1006 (1965); W. A. Bardeen, H. Fritzsch, M. Gell-Mann, In: *Scale and Conformal Symmetry in Hadron Physics*. ed. by R. Gatto (Wiley, New York 1973); H. Pagels, Phys. Rept. C **16**, 219 (1975).

[6] S. G. Gorishny, A. L. Kataev and S. A. Larin, Phys. Lett. B **259**, 144 (1991).

[7] L. R. Surguladze and M. A. Samuel, Phys. Rev. Lett. **66**, 560 (1991), 2416(E); Phys. Rev. D **44**, 1602 (1991).

[8] K. G. Chetyrkin, Phys. Lett. B **391**, 402 (1997).

[9] K. G. Chetyrkin, J. H. Kühn and A. Kwiatkowski, Phys. Rep. **277**, 189 (1996).

[10] M. A. Shifman, A. I. Vainshtein and V. I. Zakharov, Nucl. Phys. B **147**, 385 (1979).

[11] K. Schilcher and M. D. Tran, Phys. Rev. D **29**, 570 (1984).

[12] E. Braaten, Phys. Rev. Lett. **53**, 1606 (1988); Phys. Rev. D **39**, 1458 (1989).

[13] S. Narison and A. Pich, Phys. Lett. B **211**, 183 (1988).

[14] A. A. Pivovarov, Sov. J. Nucl. Phys. **54**, 676 (1991); Z. Phys. C **53**, 461 (1992); Nuovo Cim. A **105**, 813 (1992).

[15] E. Braaten, S. Narison and A. Pich, Nucl. Phys. B **373**, 581 (1992).

[16] F. Le Diberder and A. Pich, Phys. Lett. B **286**, 147 (1992).

[17] F. Wilczek, Nucl. Phys. A **663**, 3 (2000).

[18] J. G. Körner, F. Krajewski and A. A. Pivovarov, Eur. Phys. J. C **12**, 461 (2000); *ibid* C **14**, 123 (2000).

[19] B. Lautrup, Phys. Lett. B **69**, 109 (1977); R. Coquereaux, Phys. Rev. D **23**, 2276 (1981).

[20] A. H. Mueller, Nucl. Phys. B **250**, 327 (1985).

[21] V. I. Zakharov, Nucl. Phys. B **385**, 452 (1992); R. Akhoury and V. I. Zakharov, Nucl. Phys. B **465**, 295 (1996).

[22] I. I. Bigi, M. A. Shifman, N. G. Uraltsev and A. I. Vainshtein, Phys. Rev. D **50**, 2234 (1994).

[23] D. J. Broadhurst and A. G. Grozin, Phys. Rev. D **52**, 4082 (1995); M. Beneke and V. Braun, Phys. Lett. B **348**, 513 (1995); C. N. Lovett-Turner and C. J. Maxwell, Nucl. Phys. B **452**, 188 (1995).

[24] D. J. Broadhurst, A. L. Kataev and C. J. Maxwell, Nucl. Phys. B **592**, 247 (2001).

[25] C. Contreras, G. Cvetic, K. S. Jeong and T. Lee, Phys. Rev. D **66**, 054006 (2002); G. Cvetic, C. Dib, T. Lee and I. Schmidt, Phys. Rev. D **64**, 093016 (2001); G. Cvetic, Phys. Lett. B **486**, 100 (2000).

[26] N. V. Krasnikov and A. A. Pivovarov, Russ. Phys. J. **25**, 55 (1982) [hep-ph/0201143].

[27] R. Alkofer and L. von Smekal, Phys. Rept. **353**, 281 (2001) [arXiv:hep-ph/0007355].

[28] N. V. Krasnikov and A. A. Pivovarov, Mod. Phys. Lett. A **11**, 835 (1996); Phys. Atom. Nucl. **64**, 1500 (2001); [arXiv:hep-ph/9607247]; A. A. Penin and A. A. Pivovarov, Phys. Lett. B **401**, 294 (1997); Y. L. Dokshitzer and N. G. Uraltsev, Phys. Lett. B **380**, 141 (1996).

[29] S. V. Faleev and P. G. Silvestrov, Nucl. Phys. B **507**, 379 (1997).

[30] L. N. Epele, H. Fanchiotti, C. A. Garcia Canal and M. Marucho, "Generalized Borel Transform Technique in Quantum Mechanics," arXiv:hep-th/0208164.

[31] S. Groote, J. G. Körner and A. A. Pivovarov, Phys. Lett. B **407**, 66 (1997), Mod. Phys. Lett. A **13**, 637 (1998).

[32] N. N. Bogoliubov and D. V. Shirkov, Quantum fields (Benjamin, 1983).

[33] A. A. Penin and A. A. Pivovarov, Phys. Lett. B **367**, 342 (1996); Phys. Atom. Nucl. **60**, 2056 (1997) [arXiv:hep-ph/9612489]; T. Hatsuda, T. Kunihiro and T. Tanaka, Phys. Rev. Lett. **78**, 3229 (1997).

[34] M. B. Voloshin, Sov. J. Nucl. Phys. **36**, 143 (1982) [Yad. Fiz. **36**, 247 (1982)]; Int. J. Mod. Phys. A **10**, 2865 (1995).

[35] A. Hoang et al., Eur. Phys. J. direct C **3**, 1 (2000).

[36] P. M. Stevenson, Phys. Rev. D **23**, 2916 (1981); Phys. Rev. D **33**, 3130 (1986); P. M. Stevenson and H. D. Politzer, Nucl. Phys. B **277**, 758 (1986).

[37] S. J. Brodsky, G. P. Lepage and P. B. Mackenzie, Phys. Rev. D **28**, 228 (1983).

[38] S. Groote, J. G. Körner, A. A. Pivovarov and K. Schilcher, Phys. Rev. Lett. **79**, 2763 (1997).

[39] W. J. Marciano and A. Sirlin, Phys. Rev. Lett. **61**, 1815 (1988).

[40] E. Braaten and C. S. Li, Phys. Rev. D **42**, 3888 (1990).

[41] A. A. Pivovarov and V. F. Tokarev, Yad. Fiz. **41**, 524 (1985); K. G. Chetyrkin and A. A. Pivovarov, Nuovo Cim. A **100**, 899 (1988)

[42] B. Chibisov, R. D. Dikeman, M. Shifman and N. Uraltsev, Int. J. Mod. Phys. A **12**, 2075 (1997).

[43] I. Bigi, M. Shifman, N. Uraltsev and A. Vainshtein, Phys. Rev. D **59**, 054011 (1999).

[44] C. Bernard, A. Duncan, J. LoSecco and S. Weinberg, Phys. Rev. D **12**, 792 (1975); E. Poggio, H. Quinn and S. Weinberg, Phys. Rev. D **13**, 1958 (1976); R. Shankar, Phys. Rev. D **15**, 755 (1977); K. G. Chetyrkin, N. V. Krasnikov and A. N. Tavkhelidze, Phys. Lett. B **76**, 83 (1978).

[45] N. V. Krasnikov, A. A. Pivovarov and N. Tavkhelidze, JETP Lett. **36**, 333 (1982), Z. Phys. C **19**, 301 (1983); N. V. Krasnikov and A. A. Pivovarov, Phys. Lett. B **112**, 397 (1982); *ibid* B **161**, 373 (1985); A. A. Pivovarov, Phys. Atom. Nucl. **62**, 1924 (1999); *ibid* **65**, 1319 (2002).

[46] A. C. Kalloniatis, D. B. Leinweber, W. Melnitchouk and A. G. Williams, *Lattice Hadron Physics*. Proceedings, (Cairns, Australia, July 9-18, 2001).

[47] P. A. Baikov, K. G. Chetyrkin and J. H. Kühn, Phys. Rev. Lett. **88**, 012001 (2002).

[48] A. L. Kataev and V. V. Starshenko, Mod. Phys. Lett. A **10**, 235 (1995).

[49] T. G. Steele and V. Elias, Mod. Phys. Lett. A **13**, 3151 (1998).

[50] A. L. Kataev, N. V. Krasnikov and A. A. Pivovarov, Phys. Lett. B **107**, 115 (1981); Nucl. Phys. B **198**, 508 (1982); A. A. Pivovarov, Phys. Atom. Nucl. **63**, 1646 (2000). T. Inami, T. Kubota and Y. Okada, Z. Phys. C **18**, 69 (1983); K. G. Chetyrkin, B. A. Kniehl, M. Steinhauser and W. A. Bardeen, Nucl. Phys. B **535**, 3 (1998).

[51] W. A. Bardeen, A. J. Buras, D. W. Duke and T. Muta, Phys. Rev. D **18**, 3998 (1978).

[52] G. Chetyrkin, A. L. Kataev and F. V. Tkachov, Nucl. Phys. B **174**, 345 (1980).

[53] K. G. Chetyrkin and F. V. Tkachov, Nucl. Phys. B **192**, 159 (1981); F. V. Tkachov, Phys. Lett. B **100**, 65 (1981).

[54] T. van Ritbergen, J. A. M. Vermaseren and S.A. Larin, Phys. Lett. B **400**, 379 (1997).

[55] G. Grunberg, Phys. Lett. B **95**, 70 (1980) [Erratum-ibid. B **110**, 501 (1982)]; Phys. Rev. D **29**, 2315 (1984).

[56] N.V. Krasnikov, Nucl. Phys. B **192**, 497 (1981).

[57] A. Dhar and V. Gupta, Phys. Rev. D **29**, 2822 (1984); V. Gupta, D. V. Shirkov and O. V. Tarasov, Int. J. Mod. Phys. A **6**, 3381 (1991).

[58] S. J. Brodsky, J. R. Pelaez, N. Toumbas, Phys. Rev. D **60**, 037501 (1999); J. R. Pelaez, S. J. Brodsky, C. Merino and N. Toumbas, Nucl. Phys. Proc. Suppl. **86**, 216 (2000) [arXiv:hep-ph/9909311].

[59] K. G. Chetyrkin, B. A. Kniehl and M. Steinhauser, Phys. Rev. Lett. **79**, 2184 (1997).

[60] A. A. Penin, A. A. Pivovarov, Phys. Lett. B **435**, 413 (1998), B **443**, 264 (1998), Nucl. Phys. B **549**, 217 (1999); J. H. Kühn and M. Steinhauser, Nucl. Phys. B **619**, 588 (2001) [Erratum-ibid. B **640**, 415 (2002)] [arXiv:hep-ph/0109084].

[61] K.G. Chetyrkin, J.H. Kühn and A.A. Pivovarov, Nucl. Phys. B **533**, 473 (1998); A. Pich and J. Prades, JHEP **9806**, 013 (1998); *ibid* **9910**, 004 (1999).

[62] K. Maltman and J. Kambor, Phys. Rev. D **65**, 074013 (2002); Phys. Lett. B **517**, 332 (2001); Nucl. Phys. A **684**, 348 (2001); Phys. Rev. D **62**, 093023 (2000); K. Maltman, Nucl. Phys. Proc. Suppl. A **109**, 178 (2002); arXiv:hep-ph/0209091.

[63] S. Chen, M. Davier, E. Gamiz, A. Hocker, A. Pich and J. Prades, Eur. Phys. J. C **22**, 31 (2001).

[64] J.G. Körner, F. Krajewski and A.A. Pivovarov, Eur. Phys. J. C **20**, 259 (2001); A. A. Pivovarov, "Extraction of the strong coupling constant and strange quark mass from semileptonic tau decays," Lecture given at International School "Heavy Quark Physics" Dubna, May 28 - June 5, 2002, Russia, MZ-TH/02-26, November 2002 [arXiv:hep-ph/0211257].

[65] A. A. Pivovarov, "Spectrality, coupling constant analyticity and the renormalization group," MZ-TH-01-13, Apr 2001, 19pp. Yad.Fiz., to appear, [arXiv:hep-ph/0104213]; S. Groote, J. G. Körner and A. A. Pivovarov, Phys. Rev. D **65**, 036001 (2002).

[66] N. V. Krasnikov and A. A. Pivovarov, Phys. Lett. B **116**, 168 (1982); A. V. Radyushkin, JINR Rapid Commun. **78**, 96 (1996) [arXiv:hep-ph/9907228]; M. R. Pennington, R. G. Roberts and G. G. Ross, Nucl. Phys. B **242**, 69 (1984).

[67] D. V. Shirkov, Eur. Phys. J. C **22**, 331 (2001); S. J. Brodsky, S. Menke, C. Merino and J. Rathsman, "On the Behavior of the Effective QCD Coupling alpha tau(s) at Low Scales," [arXiv:hep-ph/0212078].